

REMARKS

Claims 1-11 are pending in the present application. All of these claims stand rejected. Claims 1, 4 and 6 have been amended. The features added to claims 1 and 6 are disclosed in the specification on page 4, lines 32-33; page 5, lines 7-9; page 5, lines 24-28; and page 6, lines 7-9 of the specification, for example. The Applicant requests reconsideration of the rejections in light of the following comments.

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. The amendments to claim 1 are believed to obviate this rejection and withdrawal is requested, accordingly.

Claims 1-3, 5, and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Walker et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,529,602). The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for the following reasons.

With respect to independent claims 1 and 6, the Office Action asserts that Walker discloses all of the elements of these claims. The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this assertion and submits that Walker does not teach or suggest all of the elements of the claims. Specifically with respect to claim 1, Walker does not teach the claimed element of "in response to the CTI call message, caused by the control system, mirroring the communication connection between the first user and the second user ~~onto~~ a communication connection between a virtual terminal associated with the digital switching system and the digital recording system for at least one of transferring digital communication to and storing digital communication data in the digital recording system." Rather, Walker discloses granting at least one calling party access to recorded audio communication data through the use of a cryptographic key and unique access code. That is, Walker does not teach or even contemplate responding to a CTI call message in a way that a communication connection between the first and second users is mirrored onto a communication connection between a virtual terminal associated with a digital switching system and a digital recording system. Walker simply provides access to an audio vault 12 as illustrated in Fig. 1A. Moreover, Walker does not teach or contemplate computer telephony integration ✓ (CTI). Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully submits that all of the elements of claim 1 are not taught or suggested by Walker and request that their rejection be withdrawn, accordingly.

With respect to independent claim 6, Walker, *inter alia*, does not teach or suggest control equipment for controlling a digital switching system and initiating exchange of digital communication data between a digital recording system and the digital switching system as featured in this claim. Furthermore, Walker does not teach or suggest a control equipment also "configured to issue a control command to mirror the communication connection between the first and second users between a virtual terminal associated with the digital switching system and the digital recording system as featured in claim 6. Accordingly, for this reason and the reasons presented above with respect to independent claim 1, claim 6 is submitted to be allowable over the prior art of record.

With respect to dependent claims 2, 3, and 5, these claims are believed to be allowable at least by virtue of their dependency on independent claim 1. Claims 4, 8, and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Walker in view of Garcia (U.S. Patent No. 6,442,247). The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection and submits that these claims are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency on independent claims 1 or 6. Notwithstanding, the Applicant also submits that Garcia relates to prerecorded messages of an agent to a car and not to recording conversations between the agent and the caller. Accordingly, the Applicant submits that one of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to look to the teachings of Garcia in order to provide a CTI processor. Moreover, Garcia does not teach or suggest mirroring communication connections.

Claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Walker et al. in view of Weishut et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,047,057). The Applicant respectfully submits that this claim is allowable at least by virtue of its dependency on independent claim 6.


Claims 10 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Walker et al. in view of Waugh et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,324,402). These claims are submitted to be allowable at least by virtue of their dependency on independent claim 6, discussed above.

In light of the foregoing comments, the Applicant respectfully submits that the application is in condition for allowance and requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

BELL, BOYD & LLOYD LLC

BY



Patrick B. Law

Reg. No. 41,549

P.O. Box 1135

Chicago, Illinois 60690-1135

Phone: (312) 781-6801

Dated: August 8, 2003